



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

but how many will agree if by this is meant an intellectualization which is an almost accidental inheritance?

The fourth and last chapter (153-256) is devoted to architecture, and here much discussion will be provoked. For, if I understand Professor Carpenter's theory, he believes that the appeal of Greek architecture is a two-dimensional and not a three-dimensional one. His remarks upon number and commensurability are very interesting, but they lead him to say (205) that "commensurability. . . and rhythm. . . are only effective upon the spectator if the matter in which they are embodied is seen as in one and the same plane". Assuming this, must we go on and believe (206) that Greek architecture was "an architecture of planes rather than solids", and (209) that ". . . it can only *define or bound solid space, and cannot enclose it*"²? Doubtless the Greeks made no great contribution to the art of enclosing space, but, as a fact, can we apprehend their architecture in two dimensions? Must it be compared to a Jesuit façade? Must it share the author's criticism of modern architects for their paper flatness (107), or is this flatness of much greater degree and is the two-dimensional aspect of Greek architecture only a question of emphasis?

After all, Anthemios and Isodoros were Greeks and, I suppose, belonged to that East Mediterranean people (215) who lived "in a *much less three-dimensional world*³ than the North Europeans". And, finally, would our apprehension of the mass of a Doric entablature, adequately carried by the colonnade, exist without a lively apprehension of the third dimension? Surely Professor Carpenter cannot have expressed himself so as to be clearly understood, for, in another place (220), he says, of Greek architecture, "as in Greek relief, the third dimension is not suppressed, but abbreviated".

Finally, it is to be hoped that this first volume of the Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs is to be followed by others of equal value, published in the same attractive form. In this connection, I should like to offer a suggestion, that the notes be numbered continuously from beginning to end of the book, that the reader may avoid the constant reference to the Index, to discover in what chapter the page being read belongs, in order to locate the note in question at the back of the book.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

BUTLER MURRAY

The Legacy of Greece. Edited by R. W. Livingstone: Oxford: at the Clarendon Press (1921). Pp. xi¹ + 424.

The contents of this volume are as follows:

The Value of Greece to the Future of the World, Gilbert Murray (1-23); Religion, W. R. Inge (25-56); Philosophy, J. Burnet (57-95); Mathematics and Astronomy, T. L. Heath (97-136); Natural Science, D'Arcy W. Thompson (137-162); Biology, Charles Singer (163-200); Medicine, Charles Singer (201-248); Literature, R. W. Livingstone (249-287); History, Arnold Toynbee (289-320); Political Thought,

A. E. Zimmern (321-352); The Lamps of Greek Art, Percy Gardner (353-396); Architecture, Reginald Blomfield (397-424).

It is a notable array of names that Mr. Livingstone has enlisted in the service of this endeavor to present in one volume what Germany and America have undertaken to set forth in two ambitious series, *Das Erbe der Alten*, and *Our Debt to the Classics*.

Whatever else these essays may be, they are all literary compositions, all readable. They seem to have been written on another planet and for another race of readers than that which can produce and digest the triple sawdust (as I once characterized its predecessor) of Stemplinger's *Horaz im Urteil der Jahrhunderte* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2.67-68). Such unity as the collection possesses is due to the direction imparted by Professor Murray's introductory essay on *The Value of Greece to the Future of the World*. Professor Murray restates, with his unfailing charm, some of the conventional topics about the Greek genius and its significance for us, and especially stresses the idea that the qualities that make contact with the Greek mind so stimulating and so salutary to us reveal themselves in other fields than mere literature—in the art of course, but also in the science, the textbooks, the speculative and the practical philosophies of the Greeks.

For these reasons, and also perhaps to avoid competition with the Oxford volume of 1912 on *English Literature and the Classics* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 8.125-127), literature in this volume is confined to the one generalizing chapter (249-287) in which the editor eloquently restates some of the leading ideas of his book on the Greek genius—the simplicity, the perfection of form, the truth and the beauty of Greek literature (*THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 6.132-134). To these commonplaces, expressed in no commonplace fashion, he adds two interesting considerations: (1) Greek literature, unlike the French and the English literature of the past hundred and fifty years, was not a succession of reactions between the opposite extremes of realism and romanticism, but an orderly progression and development; (2) the imitation of the Greeks does not, like the imitation of recent moderns, impair individuality. The English poets who owe most to Greece—Milton, Grey, Shelley, Keats, Landor, Tennyson, Matthew Arnold, Swinburne, Bridges—have little in common except perhaps perfection of form, and this common element vanishes if we add the Brownings. Greek influence stimulates and inspires, yet leaves the poet free to develop his own genius with enlarged horizons and quickened sensibilities.

For the rest, the contributors, as was to be expected in such a joint enterprise, govern themselves Cyclops-fashion οὐδ' ἄλλῃλων ἀλέγουσι. Only a few attempt close-packed summaries of facts. Sir T. L. Heath (author of *Aristarchus of Samos*), who writes on mathematics and astronomy (97-136), gives an admirable survey of the history of Greek geometry, but cuts off astronomy with a page. *The Natural Science* of Professor D'Arcy W. Thompson (author of

¹ The italics are Professor Carpenter's.

A Glossary of Greek Birds) is eloquent in praise of Aristotle the Biologist, and quotes many illustrations of the range and the minuteness of his knowledge, especially of the forms of sea life. But his essay is in no sense a philosophic study of the science of the ancients. Mr. Charles Singer (editor of a series of studies on the history of science) writes interestingly and, so far as I can judge, competently on biology before and after Aristotle, and on the history of medicine. These articles are illustrated.

The other essayists hardly attempt objectivity, system, or completeness, but frankly emphasize and discuss whatever interests them most and so gives them the best chance of interesting their readers. Dean Inge has little or nothing to say on historical Greek religion—less than Mr. Lowes Dickinson in his book on *The Greek View of Life*. He prefers to dwell mainly on the Hellenic element in Christianity. To that he adds a few reflections in comparison and contrast of the Greek and the modern spirit. Professor Burnet was evidently bored by the idea of writing another elementary survey of the history of Greek philosophy, and so he talks mainly of the pre-Socratics and Pythagoras, and of the mystic Socrates and the doctrine of the soul. His great services to Greek scholarship and the history of philosophy give him license to indulge his caprice. But does he really believe that the protreptic discourse originated in the impulse to the conversion of souls? Or was its origin, as I have always supposed, the introductory lecture of the teacher or sophist bidding for the interest and attention of students? Professor Toynbee presses the interesting analogies which he discovers between Greek and modern history so far as to find a remarkable parallel “between the mediaeval movement of expansion which is called the Crusades” and the “propagation of ancient Greek city states round the same shores between about 750 and 600 B. C.” The body of his essay is based on a framework of four reasons for still studying the civilization of ancient Greece which he develops with much ingenuity and force: (1) In Greek history the plot of civilization has been worked out to its conclusion; (2) The historical experience of the Greeks has been more finely expressed than ours; (3) It has an emotional value comparable to what Aristotle calls the catharsis of tragedy; (4) Its remoteness and objectivity make it a lesson in comparative method of study. Professor Zimmern, as was to be expected, treats the political thought of Greece from the point of view of a thoughtful modern liberal, not to say radical. He points out, of course, the obvious differences of scale and economic conditions that forbid the direct application of the lessons of Greek history to modern processes. Nevertheless we have much to learn from the Greeks. They invented the study of politics, the Athenian citizen was more conscientious than the modern in the fulfilment of his civic duties, the Greek writers—a Thucydides and even a Plato—were realists in their political thinking, and, as Graham Wallas points out, they began at the right end with human and social psychology. The essay concludes with some illustrations of the pertinency of Thucydides,

Plato, and Aristotle to modern problems. Thucydides would have understood and recognized the mood of our post-war world. Plato points to the regulative value of even an unrealizable ideal.

Beginning with a plea for greater consideration of Ruskin's writing on art, Professor Gardner takes the fanciful Ruskinian title “The Lamps of Greek Art” for his sketch of the history of Greek sculpture. Ruskin said that he had always distrusted the number seven because of his difficulty of keeping within that limit. Professor Gardner allows himself eight lamps: (1) humanism, (2) simplicity, (3) balance and measure, (4) naturalism, (5) idealism, (6) patience, (7) joy, (8) fellowship. The article is well illustrated. On page 374 a contrast is pointed by the juxtaposition of Poly-euctus's Demosthenes with Barnard's Lincoln. That is clever, but why not take the St. Gaudens's Lincoln? The book concludes with an illustrated chapter on Greek architecture, by Sir Reginald Blomfield. We can never hope to revive Greek architecture; we should not attempt to do so, he says, but we can learn much from its spirit. The Greek “was happy with his inner vision of beauty and intent only on its realization. He had not the smallest desire to shock or startle anyone. . . . Instead of repudiating the work of his fathers, the Greek carried it on to perfection”.

The apologetic purpose—the plea for classical studies—, though not tiresomely stressed, runs through the volume as a *Leit-motiv*. It is most prominent, of course, in the papers of Professors Murray and Livingstone. But Professor Gardner interpolates a vigorous page on the theme (394), Toynbee answers the eternal objection that whatever the Greeks have to teach has already been assimilated by modern civilization, Heath exhibits the complete dependence of mathematical terminology on Greek, and Zimmern observes (332), “If it is going too far to say that every modern politician owes his stock-in-trade of general ideas to the Greeks, there are certainly few who do not owe them their perorations”. He appears to have overlooked the ingenious argument against the Classics that Mr. H. G. Wells has extracted from these facts. “The eccentricities of modern education”, laments Mr. Wells, “make us dependent for a number of our political terms upon those used by the thinkers of the small Greek republics of ancient times before those petty states collapsed through sheer political ineptitude before the Macedonians”.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PAUL SHOREY

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS

Two Fellowships in Greek Archaeology—the School Fellowship and the Fellowship of the American Institute of Archaeology—, of \$1,000 each, are awarded annually. Candidates should apply, in writing, before February 1, to Professor Samuel E. Bassett, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vt., Chairman of the Committee on Fellowships. From him all necessary information can be obtained. Concerning a third Fellowship—one in Architecture—, of \$1,500, application should be made to Professor Edward Capps, Princeton, N. J.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LA RUE VAN HOOK